

## REMARKS/ARGUMENT

### I. EXAMINER'S COMMENTS

The Examiner contends that U.S. Patent No. 4,787,040 to Ames et al. ("Ames") discloses a plurality of profiles which permit a display to be reconfigured by a user. (Final Office Action, at 2). Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider.

In support, the Examiner cites to col. 5, lines 37-62 of Ames, which is reproduced below for the Examiner's convenience:

Entertainment systems block 10 controls the entertainment functions of the vehicle such as the AM/FM stereo radio, cassette player, cellular telephone and compact disk player. The Climate Controls systems block 11 controls the heating, ventilation and air conditioning system of the vehicle. Instrument Panel block 13 controls the display of functions such as the speedometer, engine oil and other associated engine functions. Body Control systems block 14 controls vehicle data such as tie of day clock, trip odometer and trip computer functions. Engine Control systems block 15 controls the operation of the engine and provides information for display on the Instrument Panel block 13 as well as information to the Body Control systems block 14 for use in trip computer calculations. The Vehicle Display system block 12 accepts information via the Poll/Response bus 17 from the Body Control systems block 14 and the Engine Control systems block 15 for display to the vehicle operator. *The Vehicle Display system block 12 accepts inputs from the vehicle operator in the form of switch sense and touch sense inputs from automobile status switches bus 18.* The Vehicle Display system block 12 also generates commands across the Random Access bus 16 to the Climate Control systems block 11 and Entertainment systems block 10 based on the input from the vehicle operator.

(Ames; col. 5, lines 37-62, emphasis added).

Applicant agrees with the Examiner that the above-cited passage (and especially the portion emphasized by Applicant) indicates that Ames permits the user to interact with the display system. Indeed, one of the primary objects of Ames is to provide "a system designed to serve as a centralized control point for most vehicle comfort, entertainment, and information display functions." (Ames; col. 2, lines 31-33). Interaction with the Ames display system is

effectuated by a touch screen system which “[simulates] the buttons, knobs, and indicators with graphical and textual information.” (Ames; col. 2, lines 27-29).

However, interaction with a display system is not the subject matter of the claimed inventions. Claim 1, for example, requires that “the processing arrangement [be] configured to display at least one characteristic of the vehicle . . . in accordance with profile information assigned to a selected profile . . . selectable from [a] plurality of profiles by the user of the vehicle.” In other words, claim 1 relates to the manner by which characteristics (e.g., speed, RPM, gasoline level, etc.) are displayed to the user based on a user-selectable profile, not to the manner by which the user interacts with the display to control functions of the vehicle. This critical feature of the claims is not found in the Examiner’s cited section, nor is it found anywhere else in Ames.

Accordingly, for the reasons discussed below, Applicant respectfully traverses and requests that the Examiner reconsider.

## II. REJECTIONS OF CLAIMS 1-6, 8, 10-15, 19 AND 20 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-6, 8, 10-15, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,787,040 to Ames et al. (Hereinafter “Ames”). Respectfully, Applicant traverses.

Claim 1 as amended herein recites a reconfigurable display of a vehicle, comprising . . . a processing arrangement . . . configured to display at least one characteristic of the vehicle via the display arrangement in accordance with profile information assigned to a selected profile of a plurality of profiles, wherein the selected profile is selectable from the plurality of profiles by the user of the vehicle.” By providing a plurality of profiles selectable by different users, claim 1 permits “intra-group customability (e.g., individual customability for members of a defined group).” (Specification; page 1, lines 22-26). The defined group may be, for example, a family containing different members, for example, with each member of the family being assigned a different profile. (Specification; page 10, lines 5-11).

Ames relates to a display system for an automotive vehicle. The system includes a controller containing circuitry to allow it to be programmed to display monochrome or color graphics and text on an all-points-addressable display device, such as a CRT. As characterized, the design of the controller allows the display characteristics and supported functions to be changed through reconfigurable hardware and software, allowing a broad range of applications in

**different model automobiles.** (Ames; Abstract; col. 2, lines 38-43) (emphasis added). The vehicle operator controls the display system via a reconfigurable switch system, such as a touch screen. (Ames; col. 2, lines 49-53).

Although Ames discloses that the display system is reconfigurable, it is understood that the “reconfigurability” described in this reference is effectuated by the manufacturer of the vehicle to accommodate different types of vehicles, not by a user of the vehicle to accommodate his or her own preferences. (Ames; Abstract; col. 2, lines 38-43). For one type of vehicle, for example, the manufacturer may reconfigure the display to display different style of graphics and text information. This configuration may be different for another type of vehicle. Indeed, Ames states that “[t]he programmability of display type and communication format is accomplished by tables which are loaded into the video gate array . . . personalizing the communications link protocols and message formats” and explicitly states that the “reconfigurability” allows “a broad range of application [sic] in different model automobiles.” (Ames; col. 2, lines 38-43; col. 11, lines 32-36). To accommodate different display formats, Ames appears to disclose the use of different preprogrammed PROMS (or ROMS) for storing different “personalities” of the display system. (Ames; col. 8, lines 44-62).

Unlike Ames, the “reconfigurability” of the display of claim 1 is not controlled by the manufacturer to accommodate different types of vehicles, but rather is controlled by the user of the vehicle to accommodate his or her own display preferences. Ames discloses absolutely nothing in this regard. Specifically, Ames discloses nothing regarding different “profiles,” much less whether these profiles are “selectable from the plurality of profiles by the user of the vehicle,” as recited in claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable over Ames. Furthermore, since claims 2-6, 8, and 10-15 ultimately depend from claim 1, and since claims 19 and 20 contain features analogous to those of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable over Ames for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, it is kindly requested that the rejections of claims 1-6, 8, 10-15, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) be withdrawn.

### **III. REJECTIONS OF CLAIMS 7, 9, 16, AND 17 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 7, 9, 16, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Ames. Respectfully, Applicant traverses.

As described about with respect to the anticipation rejections of claims 1-6, 8, 10-15, 19 and 20, Ames fails to disclose each and every feature of claim 1, from which claims 7, 9, 16, and 17 ultimately depend. Specifically, Ames fails to disclose at least “a processing arrangement . . . configured to display at least one characteristic of the vehicle via the display arrangement in accordance with profile information assigned to a selected profile of a plurality of profiles, wherein the selected profile is selectable from the plurality of profiles by the user of the vehicle,” as recited in claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 7, 9, 16, and 17 are allowable over Ames. Accordingly, it is kindly requested that the rejections of claims 7, 9, 16, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are currently in allowable condition. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the application, allow the claims and pass this case to issue.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on March 13, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

---

Bryan N. DeMatteo  
Name of applicant, assignee or  
Registered Representative

---

Signature

---

March 13, 2006  
Date of Signature

---

Bryan N. DeMatteo  
Registration No.: 51,608  
260 W. 54<sup>th</sup> Street  
Apt. 24B  
New York, NY 10019  
(516) 816-1571